

**MINUTES**  
**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**June 7, 2006**  
**Ramada Plaza Hotel Ojibway**  
**Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan**

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

**Present**

Carmine Palombo, Chairman  
Robert Slattery, Vice-Chairman  
Steve Warren, Member  
Jerry Richards, Member  
Susan Mortel, Member  
Rob Surber, Member

Howard Heidemann, Member  
Spencer Nebel, Member  
David Bee, Member  
Bill McEntee, Member  
Kirk Steudle, Member

**Staff Present**

Rick Lilly- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Stacey Schafer- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Ron Vibbert- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Pat Schafer-MDOT/MAT  
Pat Allen-MDOT/MAT  
Terry McNinch-LTAP/MAT  
Tim Colling-LTAP/MAT

**Absent**

Frank Kelley, Commission Advisor

**Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:00pm

**Approval of May 3, 2006 Minutes - Rick Lilly**

**Mr. McEntee moved to approve the minutes, supported by Mr. Richards.  
Motion carried.**

**Correspondence and Announcements - Rick Lilly**

Mr. Warren announced that the County Road Association of Michigan (CRAM) has released the County Road Association Directory. Council members were provided copies.

Mr. Lilly informed the Council that the Asset Management Conference CD's have been sent out to all the participants. Larry Beckon is interested in knowing if any of the members would like copies of the conference on VHS or DVD format. If Council members would like copies of the actual conference they should let Mr. Lilly know. Mr. Palombo inquired about possibly putting the actual taped conference on the website. Mr. Lilly is going to check into this.

Mr. Lilly reported that the Council's webpage has been redesigned and more documentation has been placed on the web. Ellen Martin and the rest of her staff did a great job in putting this together.

### **Agency Reports**

There were no agency reports

### **Monthly Report – Rick Lilly**

Mr. Lilly handed out the monthly report to the Council member. All comments and questions were addressed.

### **Discussion regarding July 5 meeting date – Rick Lilly**

Due to the Council meeting being scheduled for the day after the 4<sup>th</sup> of July holiday, it was suggested that the Council change its regularly-scheduled meeting date. **Mr. Warren moved that the July Council meeting be moved to July 12, 2006, supported by Mr. Slattery. Motion carried.**

### **Report on Asset Management Conference – Rick Lilly**

Mr. Lilly informed the Council that there were 261 people who registered and about 215 who actually attended. The attendance numbers included three of the Transportation Commissioners. The evaluations have been summarized and handed out to the Council. The conference was well received and everything worked out well. There were a lot of positive comments about what things participants would like to see next year. The participants want more presentations on practical applications of various aspects of asset management. They want to see demonstrations on RoadSoft. And they want to see/hear more success stories. Terry McNinch and Jan Pohl were recognized by the Council for the hard work that they did on the conference. There was some discussion on whether or not to hold another conference yet this year, further north. Mr. Steudle stated that none of the planning committee members had thought about holding another meeting. If the Council would like to hold another conference the committee can put some recommendations together. Mr. Nebel mentioned that the planning committee might want to look into moving the conference around to different areas. **Mr. Nebel, moved that the Council refer further recommendations back to the planning committee for further discussion**

**on future asset management conferences, supported by Mr. Richards. Motion carried.**

### **Update on the Internet-reporting tool – Rob Surber**

Mr. Surber gave the Council an update on the Internet-reporting tool. [See attached presentation.] Mr. Surber proposed that the Council do a survey of “lessons learned” for next year’s reporting. CGI has not locked out data entry at this point for the purpose of the model and consistency, even though it says that it had to be done on June 1, 2006. There are a lot of unanswered questions about current year and next year reporting.

Regarding a follow-up request sent from CGI to the planning agencies, Mr. Bee indicated that the regions had only three days to get this information into the system. They felt that they were being asked to do the impossible. Some regions had 40-50 phone calls to make to all of their agencies. Mr. Steudle questioned why this tight time frame was given out in the first place. Mr. Surber indicated that an email was sent out a month before stating that CGI was going to be sending out a reminder note to have all the communities called in the last week of May. It should have been sent out on that Thursday or Friday, but instead it was sent out the Monday after Memorial Day. There was a previous note that was sent out telling the regions that there was going to be a survey coming out. The note was intended for the regions to use as a spring board to get more information and see how it was going, as well as some of the reasons why the reporting is not getting done.

Ms. Mortel asked what kind of follow-up we have in place now to get the data that we need. Mr. Surber indicated that this is an action item that needs to come out of the Council. One of the things that CGI is proposing is to get the remaining amount of information from the Regions, and get the spreadsheets filled out. Another thing is that it would be very useful that a survey is done to try and capture “lessons learned” to apply to next year’s cycle. Ms. Mortel questioned whether the data that was entered was adequate to do what we needed to do? Mr. Surber answered by stating that is one of the questions that the Model Analysis Team has to deal with in the future.

Mr. Surber noted that CGI has not locked out data entry at this point. Agencies can still enter data, but at some point it needs to be locked down so it can be used as a benchmark for the modeling process. Mr. Palombo asked if there is a way to cut off for CGI data analysis, but yet allow communities to continue to input data and not have it hold up the analysis that needs to be done. Mr. Surber said that this may be a possibility, further discussion and research needs to be done on this question. Mr. Palombo asked Mr. Surber to make sure that the Council is notified when CGI is no longer going to accept any information at all so that agencies can be informed. Mr. Surber indicated that CGI has no direction to turn the reporting tool off.

### **Update on Model Analysis Team (MAT) Activities – Terry McNinch**

Terry McNinch went over some of the things that directly affect Michigan Tech. Mr. McNinch spoke about the training. Council members should have all received a schedule of the different trainings that are going to be taking place. Mr. McNinch touched on the born-on-date and gave an overview of where the Council is at right now.

Mr. McNinch stated MAT has made a decision on a way to 'slice and dice' strategies. The first breakout was in four regions; U.P, Northern lower, SEMCOG, and Central lower. There are six functional class groups as well as the four surface types; asphalt, concrete, composite, and seal coat. They are not including gravel and brick. This tells us that when everything is pieced together we would have to develop deterioration curves for 96 different items listed. Some of the items listed we do not have enough information about. Instead MAT is looking at chipping this down from the regions to just statewide; down to service type and functional class as a start; which would be 24 default curves to get started. Once we get further on, in the next couple of months, we could proceed further. This is just a scope of what is all involved in building these curves.

In terms of the treatment cost, this has been worked on for the last couple of months. Temporary staff was hired to start going through local agency federal-aid projects from last year that was received from MDOT. Last Friday this research was completed. An analysis needs to be conducted on this data.

Tim Collins and Terry McNinch met with Dr. Tom Drummer about statistical sampling. One of the things that they were asked to do was to come up with quality control plan. This will be discussed in further detail at a later date.

Mr. Lilly stated that there is a lot of work that needs to be done in order to run the model. He stated that it is really critical to get the born on date and that the analysis of this data is going to take time. It was the consensus of the MAT that they are not ready to run anything because they do not have enough data to get the results needed. The MAT does not think that they are going to be able to make the July deadline, in order to get the results the Council is looking for. The MAT is moving as fast as they can. The Council wants the MAT to keep working on this and get the data that they need.

### **Discussion regarding collection of PASER data on local roads for 2006 – Report from staff**

The Council approved, at the last meeting, getting the pilot data from last years pilots and using that data. The Data Management Committee discussed that there are a number of agencies that have local road data. The chances of the data being good are probably high because they are collecting on their own and

using it for their own activities. It was suggested that the Council pay them for the miles that they have for the next year until the Council gets a system in place. Mr. Warren has been in favor of paying for data that local agencies have collected. He said we might need to work on conversion to a PASER rating. Ms. Mortel stated that if we buy the data we have no idea what the quality control is. There needs to be a recommendation on how to do quality checks. Mr. Warren stated that we need to have a QA/QC process on local roads to know what we are getting. We need to have some assurance that this data was collected appropriately. Mr. Slattery added that with agency submission they should give a write-up of how, who, and when the data was collected. Mr. Palombo stated at some point the Council needs to make a motion on all of the ideas presented and bring it before the Council at a later date. Mr. Steudle supports the idea that Mr. Slattery made; we need to know how the data was collected.

Mr. McEntee stated that we need to make a decision on how we are going to tell people what they are going to be doing. He wondered if we could use the RoadSoft data that we might collect this summer or might collect on the local road system for the software this fall. Mr. McNinch stated this should be able to be done, provided that they get the information from CGI. Mr. Richards thinks that it is going to be difficult to come up with a decision at this Council meeting because if we encourage people to do it, but don't have a program developed, we won't know what the impact is going to be and this is going to be difficult for everyone. Mr. Nebel stated that as he understands it that there are funds available for communities who want to do the collection with regional planning agencies. Mr. Lilly stated that this is correct. It is a part of the current work authorizations with the planning agencies.

Mr. Lilly stated that the Council might not want to make any decisions for the local road at this meeting. This issue should be sent back to the Data Management Committee for further discussion. Mr. Palombo stated that the committee needs to discuss this issue first at the committee meeting and come back to the Council for a written recommendation.

Mr. Warren likes the idea suggested by Mr. McNinch, that at the training, they mention that the Council is considering purchasing local road data. **Mr. Warren moved that, we communicate, through the training program, that the Council is considering the purchase of locally collected data on the non-federal aid system, supported by Mr. Nebel. Motion carried.**

#### **Recommendations for bridge reporting and forecasting – Data Management Committee**

Mr. Warren spoke about the discussion the committee had at the last meeting. For a number of months there has been a contract with Mike Markow, an expert in the area of bridge analysis and forecasting. The committee has also heard presentations from MDOT's Dave Juntunen, who has been very helpful in talking

about the state of bridge condition analysis in Michigan. **Mr. Warren moved that the Council continue to use the National Bridge Inventory for reporting the condition of bridges for both the federal-aid roads and local roads. And that, for the time being, the Council will use the bridge condition forecasting system for projecting future bridge condition and funding levels, supported by Mr. Slattery. Motion carried.** Further, it was suggested the Council should begin to establish a working relationship with the Local Bridge Advisory Board.

**Recommendations for 2006 PASER training, data collection and quality control – Data Management Committee**

Mr. McEntee pointed out that this meeting was the first meeting of the newly structured Data Management Committee. The committee reviewed the information presented by staff. Staff met with the Model Analysis Team and went over a number of questions that had been generated at the last Asset Management Council meeting. Based on the information from staff and the Model Analysis Team, **Mr. McEntee, moved:**

**With regards to PASER Training the following changes be made to the current process:**

- 1. Show them the analysis of the quality control ratings and MTU's review of sites**
- 2. Discuss with them the problems of rating concrete and composite**
- 3. Address the issue of putting too much emphasis on rating cracks. Need to consider other distresses**
- 4. Discuss the issues of speed, fatigue, and angle of sun...really stress angle of sun**
- 5. Address how recent CPM fixes affect ratings...not every crack seal takes the road back up to an 8**
- 6. Stress the seriousness of what they are doing and how it will benefit them; encourage and motivate the raters**
- 7. Discuss group dynamics and how it changes with each new individual in the vehicle. Emphasize group decision.**
- 8. Stress the need to rate the pavement and not how smooth the ride is, and**
- 9. Everyone needs to attend the entire day.**

**With regards to Data Collection:**

- 1. You cannot rate if you haven't been to the training. Reschedule if necessary. Anyone who has not been trained will not be paid if they go out and rate.**
- 2. Provide each rater with an ID number: The rater's numbers would show up in the laptop data collector when the rating is taking place.**
- 3. Turn on the GPS logs.**

4. **Emphasize that they need to slow down and get out and look at the distresses. Need to limit the number of hours or rating when fatigue begins to take place.**
5. **Finally, when a county is finished the region is to send the data directly to CGI. However, you cannot have self-healing roads.**

**With regards to the Quality Control:**

1. **Provide the QC rater with the team's rating for the segments under consideration. QC rater would then enter in the comment field what the team's missed.**
2. **Where QC ratings are 4 or less, take photos of the distress.**
3. **MTU will determine whether or not the 1% sample size is adequate.**
4. **CGI , in cooperation with MTU, will develop a number of queries for the regions to run before they send in the data to check for anomalies or obvious errors, introduce into the LDC.**

**This motion was supported by Ms. Mortel. Motion approved .**

### **Public Comment**

Alan Cooper, Manager of Wexford County Road Commission, expressed his concerns regarding the number of requests for information from the TAMC in the last several months. He only has one person he can put on this and it is right at their busiest time of year.

Former Council member, Aaron Hopper, thanked the Council for personally inviting him to this month's meeting. He noted that the Council is moving in the right direction and is very proud to be one of the original members.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm